



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to whom this subject was referred, is reported to have in contemplation a comprehensive scheme of arbitration treaties with other nations going beyond anything that has yet been done; but, so far as I know, the details of the scheme have not yet been made public.

No adequate conception can be formed of the strength of the arbitration movement during the past year without taking into account the work of a large and increasing number of organizations whose special aim is, and has for a long time been, the promotion of better relations among the nations. Foremost among these are the peace societies, of which there are now about four hundred and fifty, which have carried on a vigorous campaign through the entire year. The Twelfth International Peace Congress, composed of delegates from these societies, and others, to the number of more than five hundred, held at Rouen, France, in September last, advanced the cause of arbitration and peace in Europe to a position of public confidence and influence never known before. No less powerful was the influence exerted by the Interparliamentary Union Conference held in the early part of September at Vienna under the auspices of the Austrian government, and attended by about six hundred delegates from the various European Parliaments. A little later the International Law Association Conference held at Antwerp and attended by more than a hundred eminent jurists and publicists, devoted an entire day to the subject of arbitration, which it has made a part of its program for more than thirty years. Furthermore, national peace and arbitration conferences in different countries, many commercial and industrial associations, labor organizations, church and social clubs, women's societies, like our National W. C. T. U. and the National Council of Women, have during the year been laboring in season and out of season for the promotion of the same great object for which we have met here to-day.

It is well within bounds to say that never before has the movement for the general and permanent use of arbitration, through an established and universally recognized tribunal, been so deep and strong and widespread, and the hope of its early and complete triumph so great, as since the Conference met here last year.

Influence of the Pan-American Railway on Arbitration and Peace among the American Republics.

Address of Hon. Charles M. Pepper, Special Commissioner, at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, June 2.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In telling about the Pan-American Railway project and its possible influence on arbitration, let me first state what the plan is, what the hopes are, and even what are the limitations.

It is an old idea, this notion of linking together all the Americas by an iron and steel highway. So long as the subject was merely dreamed about, it did not come within the scope of enlisting the energies of practical men. But when the first Pan-American Conference held in Washington fourteen years ago took it up and passed resolutions, the enterprise became a little more tangible. Perhaps, like many other worthy objects con-

cerning which resolutions are passed or recommendations made in international assemblies, it would have been forgotten or regarded only as a remote aspiration, if more substantial measures had not been taken by some of the hard-headed men who were delegates to that Conference. They provided for an intercontinental survey, and they had influence enough with the Congress of the United States to get a fairly liberal appropriation, which was supplemented by other countries.

The survey was made, and when the second Pan-American Congress came to meet in Mexico something over two years ago, the full results of this engineering reconnaissance were available. Moreover, they were encouraging. Ex-Senator Henry G. Davis, a believer in the project and its persistent advocate, in the light of his experience as a railway builder said they should be followed up. When our woes were thickest over the arbitration controversies at the Mexican Conference, he had told us to look to practical measures to find the way out. So the second conference established a Permanent Committee on the subject. Mr. Carnegie, who believes in universal peace, accepted a place on the Committee along with Mr. Davis, the ambassador from Mexico, and the ministers from Peru and Guatemala, respectively. This Committee keeps in touch with the different governments and seeks to give publicity to what they are doing. Its plans are purely practical, but their fruition will have both a sentimental and an actual value for arbitration.

A further word in explanation. While it would be a magnificent enterprise for the United States to enter into treaties with the various republics of Central and South America and build this great trunk line, and while there is a precedent in the convention between the Argentine Republic and Bolivia, we all knew that this would not be done. Knowing what was not feasible, the next best thing was to secure such cooperation as was possible. This was obtained by the authority granted by Congress for the appointment of a Special Commissioner to carry out the resolution of the Conference and by the very hearty and sympathetic support extended by President Roosevelt's Administration through the State Department under Secretary Hay's direction. In this manner it came to me to spend a year in travel in the various countries and in conferring with the governments. The official report* gives the results of the mission in the form which we thought most likely to appeal to capitalists.

Since the three Americas are not likely to be joined by a railroad constructed by a single government, or by a single private company, the next best plan was to see what the different governments were doing and would do to promote within their own limits the general scheme of this North and South trunk line. This, really, was the most important part of the Special Commissioner's mission; that is, to secure the adoption of a uniform policy so that the enterprise as a whole could be carried forward. The results along this line of endeavor have been gratifyingly successful. Legislation has been enacted by several of the republics with this purpose in view and the passage of future laws is assured.

I should say, further, that while the value of railway

*This Report, covering seventy-five pages, is Senate Document No. 206, 58th Congress, 2d Session.

intercourse among different countries as a means of promoting and maintaining peace is recognized, they have not been urged to encourage railroad construction solely or even chiefly on this basis. Primarily it has been on the ground that their own material interests call for a uniform policy, and that the development of their internal resources and the growth of their commerce are reasons why they should coöperate.

Now I take it that the motive in any enterprise, however grossly material it may be, is praiseworthy when substantial results of a sentimental character follow. That is why the commercial basis and the expectation of legitimate utility are urged rather than the abstract principles of peace.

I take it also that there is no dissent from the proposition that better acquaintance among different peoples often removes the misunderstandings and friction which sometimes result in war. It even has happened in South America that railroads built for supposed reasons of national defense or for strategic purposes have been the best means of securing peaceful settlement of disputes. Besides, they have helped to bind together the loosely connected sections of a country. You are familiar with the tendency of the Latin-American countries to chip off from the parent stock and set up independent establishments of their own. The railway lines have made Mexico the compact and progressive nation that it is to-day. They have made of the old loosely-jointed Argentine Confederation a new and genuine Argentine Republic. In one of the Central American republics the revolutions came with the recurrence of the seasons. It always was one end of the country against the other end. Finally, they managed to patch up their differences long enough to build a little railroad which brought the two warring sections into communication. Then the people found their troubles had been that they did not know one another. Since they have got acquainted the two sections have quit inciting revolutions against each other.

Thus domestic quiet, which is the yawning void in so many of the Latin American Republics, is promoted and the basis laid for international peace. It is not true of these countries, whatever may be said of others, that they keep the peace at home only to make war abroad. There is less friction among these various Republics during the periods of internal tranquillity than in the intervals of turmoil and revolution. So the railway, whether it is local or intercontinental, helps.

Without entering into a discussion of delicate diplomatic questions, I may refer to the controversies of the various Spanish-American nations. Most of these relate to boundaries and are the inheritance of the Spanish and Portuguese colonial epochs. These undetermined limits have been the chief cause of the wars or the threats of wars which have proved so unsettling. They have been the constant discouragement to capital in spite of liberal concessions and franchises. You are kept informed from year to year of the progress of arbitration in securing the peaceful settlement of these matters. Without cataloguing them, I venture to state that within the last ten years more disputes have been settled in Central and South America by arbitration and diplomatic negotiation than in any other part of the world. Existing railways have been a potential force in remov-

ing international distrust and the plans for future railways have been equally potential.

Until a very recent period the geographical isolation of many of the countries was to their own liking. Some of them, for misguided reasons of state policy, actually discouraged enterprises which would bring them to the borders of their neighbors. They did not want closer acquaintanceship. This feeling of distrust and unfriendliness has been swept away. It would take too long to explain the causes. The outcome is satisfying enough. Yet I might state that every dollar that has gone into railroads in South America has made for peace and every dollar in the future will make for peace. You are doubtless aware that the five hundred million dollars of English capital invested in the Argentine railways and the very large sum of German and English money in Chile were the means of preventing the clash of arms between those two nations three years ago. Instead of going to war, they settled their boundary dispute by arbitration and then went ahead with railway enterprises which make it sure that if future questions arise these also will be arbitrated.

I might digress here a moment to sermonize a little for the benefit of the doubters; that is, those who lack faith in the Pan-American Railway project both on the business side and in the garb of a promoter of international peace. The men who first had visions of an all-Americas railway were bold dreamers. Some of them were audacious enough to imagine linking Hudson Bay with Patagonia and the Straits of Magellan. Of course they were laughed at, especially as to Patagonia. Well, my impression is that the rails are pretty near to Hudson Bay, and a few months ago while in Buenos Ayres I was shown the engineering surveys for railway lines in Patagonia and told of the plans to join them with existing systems. That is away towards the South, and in the meantime the Argentine Republic is prolonging its northern lines in Bolivia along the Pan-American route.

When the Chile-Argentine boundary was settled, the causes which for many years had made the Andes the political as well as the natural wall between the two nations seemed to lose their reason for being. There was an immediate awakening of enterprises of a material nature and it was prophesied that at last the great railway tunnel would be built. I was in Santiago when the hopefulness was greatest. Then came a period of uncertainty and pessimism. In making an official report I was rash enough to credit the Chilean government with good faith, and to venture the prediction that the long-deferred plans would be carried through. Some comment on my optimism was good-natured, some sour, but most of it was decidedly of a doubting character. These doubts were still being voiced when a few weeks ago the cable brought the news that contracts for this great Andes tunnel had been let. It may be three years or it may be five years, but I expect in some future visit to the southern end of the hemisphere to take the through train from Buenos Ayres to Valparaiso. When that train is running, it will be a daily argument for the two countries to arbitrate whatever differences may arise between them.

Another illustration. In Brazil less than a year ago all of us were oppressed with the seriousness of the dispute

with Bolivia over the Acre rubber territory. It looked as though there would be war. The Pan-American Railway project bore only indirectly on this matter, but we all hoped for a peaceful settlement, because ultimately when Bolivia has a through trunk system of railroads it also will reach the Amazon by means of the rivers and the branch lines. Talking with one of the negotiators, I asked if, the inducement of peace for its own sake not being sufficient, there was not enough in the commercial and material interests of the two countries to persuade them to spend the money they would need in making war for a different purpose—that of building railroads in the vast region. He thought there was, yet so many obstacles were thrown in the way of the negotiation that he was discouraged. Finally, by forbearance and conciliation on both sides, the controversy was arranged, and chiefly on the basis of railway construction. Now those who had no faith at least have a little more respect for the utility of commercial enterprises as means of promoting peace when the abstract principle does not seem to be sufficiently potent.

Prospective railway building helped to secure an agreement by Peru and Ecuador to arbitrate the Napo River boundary dispute a few months ago when it had reached the most threatening stage.

Incidentally to the main subject, I may say that the principle of arbitration between individuals and the state is recognized in most of the contracts which have been made for railway enterprises. It also is recognized with regard to claims in the Brazilian-Bolivian Treaty and with reference to future disputes which may arise. In the same way treaties are the basis of the projected building of railway lines by one country in the territory of another. The greatest check on territorial ambition and aggression is secured by means of railway intercourse.

Possibly I have been treating the subject on a lower level than is your custom in these Mohonk meetings, and have given more attention to its material aspects than to the moral side. I would not be understood from this as not in harmony with the higher ideals or as underestimating their value. In many places in South America I found Dr. Hale's noble utterances, translated into Spanish, in circulation and a most sympathetic spirit shown towards them. There is little trouble in securing Latin adherence to abstract principles of arbitration. At the Conference in Mexico we found one of our difficulties was a too great eagerness to adhere to the abstractions while some of us were seeking after that which could be brought within the sphere of realization. But this sympathetic spirit has its worth. Its utility among the Latin peoples as a means of propaganda for a principle is greater than with us, since we insist on turning to the ledger first and then assenting to the theory of the railway as an agency for securing and maintaining peace. But travel, trade, immigration, industry, all make for peace and all are secured through railroad development. The greater the interest any Central or South American country has in railways the greater the inducement to settle its disputes in a friendly way. There is less temptation to aggression and there is more encouragement to arbitration. Precedents are made by one arbitration and the foundation is laid for other arbitrations.

I have been asked to state what in my opinion would be the most useful section of five hundred miles in this

broad plan of the intercontinental route; that is, the link which would make most for peace and unity by establishing the intercourse and the commerce that conduce to those results. It is difficult to answer conclusively. In South America probably five hundred miles in Peru from the present terminus of the railroad at Croya to Cuzco and Sicuani would be the most beneficial because that would make absolutely certain ultimate through rail and water communication between Lima and Buenos Ayres. On this side of the Isthmus five hundred miles of railroad from Guatemala to Panama would have a vastly beneficial effect in unifying the Central American countries. Their geographical isolation causes more misunderstandings among them than other source of irritation. Three of them at the present time have under consideration a treaty which, as I have been informed, among other provisions includes arbitration. To reach the point of meeting, which was at Amapala, the Pacific coast port of Honduras, for most of the plenipotentiaries a week's travel was necessary.

A concluding word. At the outset I stated the limitations in the policy of the United States. This country of itself does not expect to build the intercontinental railway, but it is in a position to afford great aid to the various other countries to carry forward the project within their own borders. They are beginning to show their conviction that, while refraining from interference in their affairs, we as a nation desire to promote their peaceful relations and to offer to the world the proofs of their stability. That is the best means of drawing to them the foreign capital they are seeking. One controversy settled by arbitration helps them. A second dispute arranged by the same agency becomes the convincing moral argument. And this is going on now. We have found that the people and the governments in Central America and South America want the intercontinental railway in order to bring them closer to the United States and in more intimate relations with one another. The point has been reached where it is possible to say to them when trouble threatens that if they don't arbitrate it they won't get the railways they want. There you have in essence the influence of the Pan-American Railway project on arbitration.

Statue of Christ in the Andes—Set Up as a Symbol of Peace.

Carolina Huidobro in the Boston Herald, June 26.

The traveler of to-day, as he crosses the mountains between the Argentine Republic and Chile, her neighbor on the western slope of the Andes, beholds as he looks up beyond the road on which he travels a single statue of the Christ, which towers from its pedestal, which has the form of a globe symbolical—this mass of bronze resting on a pinnacle of a high mountain on the old line of demarcation.

What does it signify? The simple testimony to the whole world that two of the most progressive of the South American republics have decided, after many years of differences, regarding, first, as to whom belonged the rights of the land bordering on the Straits of Magellan, and again, as to the true limits of the boundary line between the two countries, to become as one nation, uphold-